

A New Option for a Search for α Variation: Narrow Transitions with Enhanced Sensitivity

S. G. Karshenboim

*D. I. Mendelev Institute for Metrology (VNIIM), St. Petersburg 198005, Russia and
Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, 85748 Garching, Germany*

A. Yu. Nevsky

Institut für Experimentalphysik, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, D-40225 Düsseldorf, Germany

E. J. Angstmann¹, V. A. Dzuba¹ and V. V. Flambaum^{1,2}

¹*School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052, Australia*

²*Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439-4843, USA*

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

We consider several transitions between narrow lines that have an enhanced sensitivity to a possible variation of the fine structure constant, α . This enhancement may allow a search to be performed with an effective suppression of the systematic sources of uncertainty that are unavoidable in conventional high-resolution spectroscopic measurements. In the future this may provide the strongest laboratory constraints on α variation.

PACS numbers: 06.20.Jr, 32.30.-r

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade there has been an increasing interest in a possible time-variation of fundamental physical constants (see e.g. [1]). This stimulated a number of theoretical speculations and high-precision experiments aiming to analyze various models and search for such phenomena. There have been several different motivations for such studies, ranging from theories which claim to better describe certain deeply fundamental features of nature, to the development of a new generation of ultra-stable clocks. Fundamental physics suggests that our Universe has already experienced one or a few phase transitions during its evolution with dramatic changes to the mass of leptons and current quarks, the fine structure constant, α , etc. In addition to this, certain models of the unification of the electroweak and strong interactions with gravity, or even attempts at the development of a quantum theory of gravity alone, may involve time and/or space variations of the base fundamental constants. On the experimental front, a recent breakthrough in frequency metrology, including the achievement of a record accuracy in microwave fountain standards, and the development of a new generation of optical clocks, requires strong practical tests. A cross comparison of several frequency standards serves both purposes: a search for a possible variation of the fundamental constants, that could point towards new physics, and a routine check of the most advanced frequency standards that are important even for our everyday life, such as through various high-precision global navigation systems.

Unification schemes, cosmological models, and quantum theories of gravity indicate that certain variations to the value of certain fundamental physical constants are possible but, unfortunately, they can not supply us

with quantitative details. Neither the hierarchy of the expected variation rates of the different fundamental constants is understood, nor is the form of the dependence clear. Is it a space or time variation? Is it a nearly linear drift or does it oscillate? Without responding to these basic questions we are not in a position to find out what is the most sensitive way to search for possible variations.

A comparison of different experiments to verify their results and check their consistency is also far from an easy solution. In particular a few kinds of the results have been obtained up to now and may be improved upon in the near future.

- Astrophysical observations of absorption spectra of quasars have delivered questionable results. A positive indication of a variation to the fine structure constant

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} = (-0.54 \pm 0.12) \cdot 10^{-5} \quad (1)$$

at the 5 sigma level, associated with red shifts in the range $0.2 < z < 3.7$, which corresponds to a time separation of 2.5–12.2 Gyr in the currently popular model with $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, $\Omega_{\text{matter}} = 0.3$, and $H_0 = 68 \text{ kms}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$, was obtained [2, 3, 4]. Meanwhile the recent results of other groups are consistent with zero variation at the same level of accuracy, $\Delta\alpha/\alpha = (-0.06 \pm 0.06) \cdot 10^{-5}$ at $0.4 < z < 2.3$ (4.4–11.0 Gyr) [5] and $\Delta\alpha/\alpha = (-0.04 \pm 0.33) \cdot 10^{-5}$ at $z \simeq 1.15$ corresponding to 8.5 Gyr ago [6]. All three evaluations are based on the so-called many-multiplet method suggested in [7] (a modification of this method was applied in [6]) and are related to approximately the same red-shift. However, works [5, 6] use data from a different telescope observing a different (Southern) hemisphere.

- An initial negative result from the Oklo uranium mine [8], related to a variation of a samarium resonance in the 100-meV range of the thermal neutron absorption spectrum about 2×10^9 years ago, has probably changed to a positive signal [9]. An upper boundary at the same level of accuracy was also achieved in study of slow radioactive decays [11]. The results involve numerous assumptions at various stages of examination, and in particular, when the result for a variation of a non-fundamental quantity is turned into terms of α variation. Actually, the Oklo and radioactive decay results are more sensitive to the variation of the strong interaction, rather than to the variation of α .
- A negative result from a comparison of rubidium to cesium hyperfine splitting [12] corresponds to a constraint on a time variation of the proton g factor, rather than of α variation (see, e.g., [13]).
- Recent optical measurements of transitions in the gross structure of neutral calcium and hydrogen, and singly charged ions of mercury and ytterbium, set a constraint on possible α variation to the level of few parts in 10^{15} per year [14, 16]

$$\frac{\partial \ln \alpha}{\partial t} = (-0.3 \pm 2.0) \cdot 10^{-15} \text{ yr}^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

The experiments and observations mentioned above are related to different time intervals and there is no reliable method for their model-independent comparison. Actually the original results correspond to different quantities, in the case of the geochemical data on nuclear transitions, and the spectroscopic data depends on hyperfine intervals, only under certain model-dependent assumptions can they deliver their constraints on α variation. The values related to the strong interaction (a position of samarium resonance, g factors of nuclei and the proton mass) should be interpreted in more fundamental terms. Using certain further assumptions it could be done in terms of the variation of the dimensionless parameter m_q/Λ_{QCD} , where m_q is the quark mass and Λ_{QCD} is the strong interaction QCD scale [17, 18]. Strong constraints on the variation of the electron-to-proton mass ratio and consequently on parameters of the strong interaction can be reached from spectroscopy of molecular ro-vibrational levels which have experienced a substantial progress recently (see., e.g. [19, 20, 21]).

The laboratory results on optical measurements in terms of the effective rate $\partial\alpha/\partial t$ are the least strong in the list above, but the most reliable. At present these results show great promise since they are related to optical clocks, which have progressed rapidly over the past decade. Recently transitions in a few atoms have been measured accurately, and four of them have been studied at least twice with time separation of few years. Various transitions were studied in hydrogen [22, 23], calcium [24, 25], strontium ion Sr^+ [26], neutral strontium

[27, 28], indium ion [29], ytterbium ion Yb^+ [14, 15, 30] and mercury ion Hg^+ [24, 31]. We expect that most of these transitions will soon provide us with limits on the size of a possible variation the fine structure constant at the level of a few parts in 10^{-15} per a year.

The estimation of a possible α variation from a model-independent comparison of only optical transitions is based on an accurate treatment of the relativistic effects. There are several kinds of searches which were first applied in astrophysics. They used to deal with different kinds of transitions, e.g. a comparison between the hyperfine structure (HFS) and gross structure transitions, which involve the fundamental constants in different ways (see, e.g., [13, 16]). Trying to compare two different HFS transitions *Prestage et al.* [32] suggested taking into account relativistic corrections, that have quite different values for light and heavy ions. They pointed out that the relativistic contribution is, in fractional units, of the order of $(Z\alpha)^2$, where Z is the nuclear charge. Such a big correction takes place even in a neutral alkali atoms and ions with a low degree of ionization [33], where the electron may be expected to see a screened nuclear charge much smaller than Z . This happens because the correction chiefly originates not from a broad area far from nucleus, but from a narrow area close to it. *Dzuba et al.* [7] applied this idea to optical transitions and developed a more accurate quantitative theory for transitions of hyperfine, fine and gross structure for most atoms of metrological and astrophysical interest [34, 35]. They also pointed out [35] that it may happen that the non-relativistic term (which is of order of Ry) and the relativistic contribution ($\alpha^2 Ry$) may accidentally nearly cancel each other, and two states with different non-relativistic structure (e.g. with a different orbital number L) can have nearly the same energy. In particular they suggested a measurement of the transition frequency between two states of dysprosium which both have energy of 19797.97 cm^{-1} , the same total momentum $J = 10$ but opposite parity. They belong to the $4f^{10}5d6s$ and $4f^95d^26s$ configurations. The experiment with Dy is now in progress [36].

The frequency of a transition between two atomic states can be presented in the form

$$f \simeq c_1 Ry + c_2 (Z\alpha)^2 Ry, \quad (3)$$

where Ry is Rydberg constant in frequency units, and c_1 and c_2 are coefficients representing the size of the non-relativistic and relativistic terms respectively and Z is the nuclear charge. The sensitivity of the frequency to variation of α can be described by a value

$$\kappa = \frac{\partial \ln(f/Ry)}{\partial \ln \alpha}, \quad (4)$$

which relates change of α to change of frequency

$$\frac{\partial \ln(f/Ry)}{\partial t} = \kappa \frac{\partial \ln \alpha}{\partial t}. \quad (5)$$

One can show that

$$\kappa \simeq \frac{2c_2(Z\alpha)^2}{c_1 + c_2(Z\alpha)^2}. \quad (6)$$

In most of situations the coefficients c_1 and c_2 are both of order of unity. In this case for light atoms (low Z) the sensitivity is about or below

$$\kappa = O((Z\alpha)^2).$$

For higher Z when $Z\alpha$ is not a small parameter anymore κ is $O(1)$. However, there may be a specific situations with the denominator in Eq. (6) close to zero and in such cases κ may be much larger than unity delivering an enhancement factor. In this paper we consider the possibility of performing precision experiments with neutral atoms and singly-charged ions with high κ values, that may range from figures substantially below unity up to 10^8 (as it is for dysprosium [36]). However, advantages of this great enhancement in the latter atom are of reduced value since one of these Dy levels is relatively broad, resulting in a measurement of the splitting between the degenerate levels being limited to a certain fraction of the linewidth. In [13] a slightly different idea was suggested, namely not to limit a search to only levels with very big enhancement, but instead to require narrow levels.

In this paper we present several examples of narrow transitions with enhanced sensitivity. We consider a possible enhancement of sensitivity to α variation, and pay special attention to the feasibility of a high resolution spectroscopic experiment, this implies a number of additional conditions on the spectrum.

A big value of the enhancement factor κ obviously increases the sensitivity of a transition frequency to a possible α variation. The consequences can be clearly seen from the identity

$$\frac{\Delta f}{f} = \kappa \frac{\Delta \alpha}{\alpha}, \quad (7)$$

where we suggest that a variation of frequency, f , can be expressed as a variation of α , with a variation of the Rydberg constant neglected. The latter is possible because current laboratory constraints on the possible variation of α and the numerical value of the Rydberg frequency, Ry , are at the same level [14, 16] (since they were obtained in atomic systems with $\kappa = O(1)$).

The relativistic effects can in principle strongly affect the non-relativistic theory. However the relativistic contributions to a transition frequency related to the gross structure cannot be enormously big and thus, cannot alone be responsible for a big enhancement. Actually, such transitions are possible, namely the transitions between fine structure components, for which the non-relativistic term is equal to zero. In fact this does not help much with sensitivity, it can be easily seen from Eq. (6) that this gives $\kappa = 2$.

The origin of a large enhancement is a strong cancellation between the non-relativistic and relativistic terms

which drastically reduces the value of the frequency. Both the non-relativistic terms and the relativistic contributions have, for each atomic system, certain characteristic values that set margins on possible κ values, these typically cannot exceed the level of few units of $(Z\alpha)^2$. A really big enhancement factor κ may appear if the α dependence of the frequency still has a characteristic value (in absolute units), but the frequency itself is small (i.e. the denominator of Eq. (6) is small). The widths of the levels also have certain typical values in each atom, varying for different kinds of transitions and due to external effects. For the most narrow lines effects due to collisions or residual external field may be dominant in the real linewidth.

Summarizing, we note that the transitions with a high sensitivity, κ , should possess low frequencies, but we can only take advantages of their sensitivity if the levels are narrow enough. If the level has a low frequency but a typical linewidth, the fractional uncertainty goes up. Only with the narrow lines can we hope to reach a high relative accuracy. Otherwise, a cancellation will lead to an enhancement of the sensitivity and simultaneously to a reduction of a fractional accuracy by approximately the same factor.

Currently, development of highly-accurate frequency standards involves transitions with higher and higher frequency and, in particular, optical transitions in neutral atoms or slightly charged ions. The use of optical frequencies potentially allows one to achieve a higher accuracy because of a much larger number of oscillations in a given time compared with microwave frequency standards. Choosing optical lines with small natural linewidths in general also reduces the relative influence of different systematic effects on the transition frequency and, as a result, on the accuracy of an optical standard.

At present, a number of frequency standards, based on narrow optical transitions in neutral and singly-ionized atoms are considered as the candidates for a new generation of the frequency standards with an extremely high level of accuracy [10, 15, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. The level of fractional uncertainty $\Delta f/f$ of the best measurements up to now has been a few parts in 10^{-15} , however, estimations of the possible accuracy of the presently discovered optical frequency standards give an upper limit much better than the present results approaching the level of 10^{-18} . Interest in the development and application of optical frequency standards for fundamental physics experiments has been stimulated during the last several years due to the invention of the optical frequency comb synthesizer [37], which provides a simple and extremely accurate link between the optical and radio frequency (RF) domain.

In spite of the recent progress in the development of the optical frequency standards, the Cs radio-frequency standard, with the transition frequency of about 0.3 cm^{-1} still remains the most accurate. The use of slow rubidium atoms can allow further improvement to the frequency stability of such RF standards, due to smaller collision

frequency shifts, and can potentially reach the quantum limited level of $\Delta f/f \sim 10^{-16}$ [12]. Thus, on the level exceeding the accuracy of the RF standards (10^{-16} and higher), highly accurate optical frequency standards must be compared directly with each other. On such a level of accuracy this can be realized only by bringing the optical standards to one place, which would lead to serious experimental difficulties, such as creation of transportable standards possessing an ensured extremely high level of accuracy.

II. TRANSITIONS WITH A NARROW LINEWIDTH AND AN ENHANCED SENSITIVITY TO α VARIATION

A promising approach to overcome some of these difficulties involves the creation of a frequency standard of even moderate accuracy, but based upon a transition with a large relativistic correction. This would allow the performance of highly-sensitive experiments with the aim of placing tight constraints upon a possible α variation, by comparing a possibly time-dependant frequency with the well developed Cs frequency standards, linked by GPS to the primary Cs standards at, e.g., NIST or PTB. A number of possible candidates for a frequency standard, with large enhancement factors for a possible detection of α variation, are listed in Tables I and II.

Accurate relativistic calculations are needed to reveal how an energy level will change with time in the presence of α variation. Following [35], we represent the energy of a level by

$$\omega = \omega_0 + qx \quad (8)$$

where $x = (\alpha/\alpha_0)^2 - 1$, ω_0 is the initial value of ω (i.e. the one measured at the beginning of the experiment) and q is a coefficient that determines the frequency dependence on a variation of α . Then the enhancement factor κ (6) becomes

$$\kappa = \frac{2\Delta q}{\Delta\omega_0} \quad (9)$$

where $\Delta q = q_2 - q_1$ represents the difference in the q coefficients, and $\Delta\omega_0$ the difference in energy, of the levels between which the transition occurs.

The measurement of the energy shift between two levels will be easiest to measure when this energy shift is large. It follows that the best situation would be to have two levels with relatively large shifts but with opposite sign. These levels would drift apart relatively rapidly as time passed. A compromise would be to find two levels with very different q coefficients. A level with a small q coefficient will not stray much from its initial value while a level with a large q coefficient will move quite fast, the first level can then act as a reference point for the movement of the second level. As a rule of thumb the q coefficients are negative for $s_{1/2}$ and $p_{1/2}$ states and positive for other states [34]. The easiest way to ensure that

two states have different q coefficients is to ensure that they have substantially different electron configurations.

In Table I we list pairs of long-lived almost degenerate states of different configurations. Here enhancement is mostly due to the small energy interval between the states. However, the fact that the configurations are different also contribute to the enhancement. Most of the transitions presented in the table correspond to $s-d$ or $d-f$ single-electron transitions. Since relativistic energy shifts q strongly depend on l and j of individual electrons [34] it is natural to expect that Δq is large for the transitions.

In Table II we list some metastable states that are close to the ground state. Here the enhancement is smaller due to larger energy intervals. However, measurements would be easier to perform due to convenience of dealing with transitions from the ground state.

Enhancement factors κ , presented in Tables I and II are calculated in a single-electron approximation which doesn't take into account configuration mixing. These calculations can be considered as rough estimations only. Configuration interaction can significantly change the values of κ in either way. For example, states of the same parity and total momentum J separated by small energy interval are likely to be strongly mixed. Therefore, the assignment of these states to particular configurations is ambiguous and the relative value of the relativistic energy shift Δq is likely to be small. An enhancement factor κ for such states is difficult to calculate. Its value is unstable because the transition frequency $\Delta\omega_0$ is also small. We do not include pairs of states of the same parity and momentum in Table I. One can still find metastable states of the same parity and total momentum as the ground state in Table II. Here mixing of states can be small due to the large energy separation between the states.

States of the same parity but different total momentum J can be affected by configuration mixing in a very similar way. They can be mixed with states of appropriate values of J from other configurations. This would also bring values of q_1 and q_2 for two states closer to each other. On the other hand, configuration mixing can cause anomalies in fine structure [38] or in general can have different effect on different states within the same configuration which would lead to increased sensitivity of the energy intervals to the variation of α . The detailed study of the enhancement in each listed transition goes far beyond the scope of the present work. It can be done in a much more detailed and accurate way during the planning stage of a specific experiment.

III. CONSIDERATION OF PARTICULAR CANDIDATES

For several atoms from Table II we made some rough estimates on the practical realization as candidates for possible frequency standards. Basic criteria, in spite of

TABLE I: Long lived almost degenerate states with large $\kappa = \frac{2\Delta q}{\Delta\omega_0}$, where $\Delta q = q_2 - q_1$.

Atom or ion	Z	First State			Second State			κ		
		Configuration	J	Energy (cm ⁻¹)	Configuration	J	Energy (cm ⁻¹)			
Ce I	58	$4f5d^26s$	⁵ H	3	2369.068	$4f5d6s^2$	¹ D	2	2378.827	-2000
		$4f5d^26s$		4	4173.494	$4f5d6s^2$	³ G	5	4199.367	-770
		$4f^26s^2$	³ H	4	4762.718	$4f5d6s^2$	³ D	2	4766.323	-13000
Ce II	58	$4f5d6s$	⁴ F	9/2	5675.763	$4f5d^2$		7/2	5716.216	500
		$4f5d^2$	⁴ S	3/2	8169.698	$4f5d6s$	⁴ D	5/2	8175.863	-3300
Nd I	60	$4f^35d6s^2$	⁵ K	6	8411.900	$4f^45d6s$	⁷ L	5	8475.355	950
		$4f^35d^26s$	⁷ L	5	11108.813	$4f^45d6s$	⁷ K	6	11109.167	10 ⁵
		$4f^45d6s$	⁷ I	7	13798.860	$4f^35d^26s$	⁷ K	7	13799.780	-4 · 10 ⁴
Nd II	60	$4f^45d$	⁶ L	11/2	4437.558	$4f^46s$	⁴ I	13/2	4512.481	-270
		$4f^45d$	⁶ G	11/2	12021.35	$4f^46s$	⁶ F	9/2	12087.17	-300
Sm I	62	$4f^66s^2$	⁵ D	1	15914.55	$4f^65d6s$	⁷ G	2	15955.24	500
Eu I	63	$4f^76s6p$	¹⁰ P	11/2	15581.58	$4f^75d6s$	⁸ D	9/2	15680.28	100
Gd II	64	$4f^75d6s$	⁸ D	11/2	4841.106	$4f^75d^2$	¹⁰ F	9/2	4852.304	1800
		$4f^75d^2$	¹⁰ P	7/2	10599.743	$4f^75d6s$	⁶ D	5/2	10633.083	-600
Tb I	65	$4f^96s^2$	⁶ H	13/2	2771.675	$4f^85d6s^2$	⁸ G	9/2	2840.170	-600
Tb II	65	$4f^85d6s$		6	5147.23	$4f^96s$		6	5171.76	1600

TABLE II: Metastable states sensitive to variation of α .

Atom or ion	Ground State				Metastable State			κ	
	Z	Configuration	J	Configuration	J	Energy (cm ⁻¹)			
La I	57	$5d6s^2$	^2D	$3/2$	$5d^26s$	^4F	$5/2$	3010.002	6.6
					$5d^3$	^4F	$3/2$	12430.609	3.2
La II	57	$5d^2$	^3F	2	$5d6s$	^3D	1	1895.15	-10
					$6s^2$	^1S	0	7394.57	-5.4
Ce II	58	$4f5d^2$	^4H	$7/2$	$4f5d6s$		$9/2$	2382.246	-8
Pr I	59	$4f^36s^2$	^4I	$9/2$	$4f^35d6s$	^6L	$11/2$	8080.49	2.5
Pr II	59	$4f^36s$		4	$4f^35d$	^5L	6	3893.46	5
Nd I	60	$4f^46s^2$	^5I	4	$4f^45d6s$	^7L	5	8475.355	2.6
Nd II	60	$4f^46s$	^6I	$7/2$	$4f^45d$	^6L	$11/2$	4437.558	4.5
Sm I	62	$4f^66s^2$	^7F	0	$4f^65d6s$	^9H	1	10801.10	2
Sm II	62	$4f^66s$	^8F	$1/2$	$4f^65d$	^8H	$3/2$	7135.06	3
Eu I	63	$4f^76s^2$	^8S	$7/2$	$4f^75d6s$	^{10}D	$5/2$	12923.72	1.9
Eu II	63	$4f^76s$	^9S	4	$4f^75d$	^9D	2	9923.00	2
Gd I	64	$4f^75d6s^2$	^9D	2	$4f^75d^26s$	^{11}F	2	6378.146	3
Gd II	64	$4f^75d6s$	^{10}D	$5/2$	$4f^76s^2$	^8S	$7/2$	3444.235	-6
Tb I	65	$4f^96s^2$	^6H	$15/2$	$4f^85d6s^2$	^8G	$13/2$	285.500	-140
Pt I	78	$5d^96s$	^3D	3	$5d^86s^2$	^4F	4	823.7	-24
Pt II	78	$5d^9$	^2D	$5/2$	$5d^86s$	^4F	$9/2$	4786.6	-6
Ac III	89	$7s$	^2S	$1/2$	$6d$	^2D	$3/2$	801.0	25
					$6d$	^2D	$5/2$	4203.9	5

general lack of available information, included lifetime of the clock transition as well as the possibility of detecting the excitations and cooling the atoms in order to reduce a number of systematic frequency shifts, such as second-order Doppler effect, collision shifts, etc.

A. Neutral platinum and ion Pt⁺ (Pt II)

The spectrum of neutral and singly ionized platinum is attractive for a search for a possible α variation because of the relatively large relativistic corrections (see

Table II). According to [39], the lifetimes of the ³F₄ and the ⁴F_{9/2} levels of Pt and Pt⁺ are extremely high, corresponding gA values (g is degeneracy of the level, A is the Einstein spontaneous transition rate) are of the order of 10⁻⁹ s⁻¹. The use of the stable ¹⁹⁵Pt isotope with the nuclear spin $I = 1/2$ would increase the transition dipole moment due to nuclear spin-orbit interaction, however leading to additional re-pumping from the HFS sublevels. Because of the rich energy structure, direct laser cooling of Pt and Pt⁺ is difficult to realize. The use of the appropriately strong E1 transitions from the 5d⁷6s ⁴F₂ in Pt as well as a similar transition from the 5d⁸6p ⁴D_{7/2} in

Pt^+ would require a large number of re-pumping lasers, which increases the complexity of the setup. In the case of Pt^+ one can consider trapping of a single platinum ion in a quadrupole radio-frequency trap and the use of the sympathetic cooling approach [40] to reduce a temperature of the ion. This can also provide an efficient excitation detection on the Pt^+ clock transition via a vibration motion phonon exchange with a coolant ion (i.e., via so-called “quantum-logic” spectroscopy) [41].

B. Actinium ion Ac^{++} (Ac III)

The francium-like doubly ionized actinium ion possesses a relatively simple spectrum. There is no information about lifetime of the $6d_{3/2}$ and the $6d_{5/2}$ levels, however, due to the small transition frequency and the same parity of the ground and the upper levels we estimate the linewidth of the transitions to be sufficiently small.

Recent results from trapping and high resolution spectroscopy of the neutral francium atoms [42] in the magneto-optic traps (MOT) raised interest and opened new possibilities in the precision study of the radioactive elements, especially in the tests of the standard model via parity violation experiments. In application to an optical frequency standard one can consider trapping a single Ac^{++} ion in a quadrupole radio-frequency trap. Efficient trapping of the multiply charged ions has been realized (see, for example, [43]), also single hydrogen-like ions were studied in the Penning trap [44]. However, as in the case of platinum, direct laser cooling of the actinium ion due to its energy level structure seems to be a problem and most probably sympathetic laser cooling and “quantum-logic” detection is required.

C. Neutral terbium (Tb I)

In spite of the absence of information about the lifetimes of the metastable states $^8\text{G}_{13/2}$ and $^8\text{G}_{1/2}$ at 285.5 cm^{-1} in the neutral terbium, we estimate the lifetime to be large especially for the $^8\text{G}_{1/2}$ level, from which transition to the ground state is strongly forbidden ($J = 15/2$ to $J = 1/2$ transition). The main natural isotope of terbium (^{159}Tb) possesses nuclear spin $I = 3/2$, thus allowing the use of the advantages of the $m = 0 \rightarrow m' = 0$ clock transition. The transition wavelength $\lambda = 35 \mu\text{m}$ is quite large which strongly minimizes the influence of the first- and the second-order Doppler effect, especially with a reduction of the effective temperature of the atoms. However, laser cooling of terbium is not possible due to its very rich energy structure. According to the Boltzmann distribution the metastable $^8\text{G}_{13/2}$ state at 285.8 cm^{-1} has a significant thermal population at room temperature (occupation number is about 0.25) and some kind of re-pumping should be applied in order to perform the high-resolution spectroscopy of this transition.

A cryogenic cooling of the apparatus should be used to reduce the influence of the black body radiation (BBR) on the clock transition by means of an induced ac-Stark and ac Zeeman shifts [45]. High-resolution spectroscopy on the terbium clock transition entails the problem of creation of a coherent radiation source at the wavelength of $35 \mu\text{m}$ with a high level of frequency stability and spectral purity. Apart from the use of a different kinds of submillimeter lasers or the quantum cascade lasers [46], another promising approach is the phase-matched difference-frequency mixing of the frequency stable optical radiations in certain kinds of nonlinear crystals with a wide transmitting range (GaP, DAST, [47]). Conservation of the relative frequency stability in the THz radiation by the optical down-conversion would open a possibility for high-resolution spectroscopy in the submillimeter range with an accuracy comparable to that of in the optical measurements. This would allow to realize the advantages of the low-frequency transitions with the high q -values in the experiments for the search of a possible time-variation of the fine structure constant α .

IV. SUMMARY

By itself a large value of the enhancement factor, κ , is not enough to develop a highly sensitive search for a variation of fundamental constants. We list below the necessary conditions.

The general requirement are:

- Two levels (A and B) with different non-relativistic quantum numbers should be close to each other. The best situation is related to the case when at least one of valence electrons is in the different state, e.g., the s^2 and sd configurations. However, a different configuration of electrons in the same electronic states as e.g. $d^2 \text{ S}$ and $d^2 \text{ D}$ is also possible, but the relativistic corrections in the latter case are smaller. Close levels are levels where the relativistic separation (fine structure) is substantially bigger than the difference between the two different levels A and B .
- The levels must be narrow enough and systematic frequency shifts on the transition frequency should be small, enabling accurate determination of the transition frequency. Basically, the ratio of the relative measurement uncertainty, $\delta f/f$, to the enhancement factor, κ , is a characteristic value for comparison with other searches [48].
- It should be possible to induce a transition between A and B and to have an efficient tool to detect it. Cooling of the atoms is essential in order to increase the accuracy in frequency measurements. As we see from our consideration above it is not easy to satisfy such obvious requirement.

The number of successful detection and cooling schemes for precision spectroscopy is quite limited and this leads to strong limitations on candidates. However, recent progress in the "quantum-logic" spectroscopy [41] opens new possibilities in cooling and high-resolution spectroscopy of a large number of ions.

Advantages of the enhancement are twofold. Firstly, we can make a measurement with a reduced accuracy and still reach a competitive result. This allows one to get rid of certain systematic effects present in the most precision measurements. Secondly, if a high precision measurement is possible (as we hope in the case of some narrow transitions) the enhancement may offer the strongest test possible in a laboratory study.

In summary, we presented a number of narrow transitions with a large enhancement factor and discussed various problems involved in realization of precision frequency measurements for these transitions. A successful

experiment with one of these or, perhaps, some other similar transitions may set new strong constraints on a possible variation of the fine structure constant α .

Acknowledgments

An initial part of this work was done during a short visit of VF to MPQ, Garching and he would like to thank MPQ for hospitality. The work of SK was supported in part by the RFBR under grants 03-02-04029 and 03-02-16843, and by DFG under grant GZ 436 RUS 113/769/0-1. The work of VF was supported in part by the Australian Research Council and Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Physics, Contract No. W-31-109-ENG-38. The authors gratefully acknowledge stimulating discussions with D. Budker, S. Schiller and J. L. Hall.

-
- [1] S. G. Karshenboim and E. Peik (Eds.). *Astrophysics, Clocks and Fundamental Constants*, (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004), Vol. 648.
 - [2] J. K. Webb, M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, V. A. Dzuba, J. D. Barrow, C. W. Churchill, J. X. Prochaska, and A. M. Wolfe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 091301 (2001).
 - [3] M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, V. A. Dzuba, C. W. Churchill, J. X. Prochaska, J. D. Barrow, A. M. Wolfe, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **327**, 1208 (2001).
 - [4] M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **345**, 609 (2003).
 - [5] R. Srianand, H. Chand, P. Petitjean, and B. Aracil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 121302 (2004).
 - [6] R. Quast, D. Reimers and S. A. Levshakov, Astron. Astrophysics **415**, L7 (2004).
 - [7] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and J. K. Webb, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 888 (1999).
 - [8] A. I. Shlyakhter, Nature (London) **264**, 340 (1976); T. Damour and F. Dyson, Nucl. Phys. B **480**, 596 (1994); Y. Fujii, A. Iwamoto, T. Fukahori, T. Ohnuki, M. Nakagawa, H. Hidaka, Y. Oura, and P. Moller, Nucl. Phys. B **573**, 377 (2000).
 - [9] S. K. Lamoreaux and J. R. Torgerson, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 121701 (2004).
 - [10] L. Hollberg, C.W. Oates, G. Wilpers, C.W. Hoyt, Z.W. Barber, S.A. Diddams, W.H. Oskay and J.C. Bergquist, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys **38**, 469 (2005)
 - [11] K. A. Olive, M. Pospelov, Y.-Z. Qian, G. Manhès, E. Vangioni-Flam, A. Coc and M. Cassé, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 027701 (2004).
 - [12] H. Marion, F. Pereira Dos Santos, M. Abgrall, S. Zhang, Y. Sortais, S. Bize, I. Maksimovic, D. Calonico, J. Gruenert, C. Mandache, P. Lemonde, G. Santarelli, Ph. Laurent, A. Clairon, and C. Salomon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 150801 (2003).
 - [13] S. G. Karshenboim, Can. J. Phys. **78**, 639 (2000).
 - [14] E. Peik, B. Lipphardt, H. Schnatz, T. Schneider, Chr. Tamm, and S. G. Karshenboim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 170801 (2004).
 - [15] T. Schneider, E. Peik, Chr. Tamm, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 230801 (2005).
 - [16] S. G. Karshenboim, V. V. Flambaum, and E. Peik, in G.W.F. Drake, *Handbook on Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics* (Springer, 2005), p. 455; physics/0410074.
 - [17] V. V. Flambaum, E. V. Shuryak. Phys. Rev. D **65**, 103503 (2002); Phys. Rev. D **67**, 083507 (2003).
 - [18] V. V. Flambaum, physics/0309107; V. V. Flambaum, D. B. Leinweber, A. W. Thomas, R. D. Young, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 115006 (2004).
 - [19] G.D. Rovera and O. Acef, IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas. **48**, 571 (1999).
 - [20] A. Shelkovich, Ch. Grain, C.T. Nguyen, R.J. Butcher, A. Amy-Klein, Ch. Chardonnet, Appl. Phys. B **73**, 93 (2001); A. Amy-Klein, A. Goncharov, M. Guinet, C. Daussy, O. Lopez, A. Shelkovich, and Ch. Chardonnet, Opt. Lett., to be published.
 - [21] S. Schiller and V. Korobov Physical Review A **71**, 032505 (2005).
 - [22] M. Niering, R. Holzwarth, J. Reichert, P. Pokasov, Th. Udem, M. Weitz, T. W. Hänsch, P. Lemonde, G. Santarelli, M. Abgrall, P. Laurent, C. Salomon, and A. Clairon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5496 (2000).
 - [23] M. Fischer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 230802 (2004).
 - [24] T. Udem, S. A. Diddams, K. R. Vogel, C. W. Oates, E. A. Curtis, W. D. Lee, W. M. Itano, R. E. Drullinger, J. C. Bergquist, and L. Hollberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4996 (2001).
 - [25] C. Degenhardt, T. Nazarova, C. Lisdat, H. Stör, U. Sterr, and F. Riehle, IEEE Trans. IM **54**, 771 (2005).
 - [26] H. S. Margolis, G. Huang, G. P. Barwood, S. N. Lea, H. A. Klein, W. R. C. Rowley, P. Gill, and R. S. Windeler, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 032501 (2003).
 - [27] M. Takamoto, F.-L. Hong, R. Higashi, and H. Katori, Nature **435**, 321 (2005); F.-L. Hong, M. Takamoto, R. Higashi, Y. Fukuyama, J. Jinag and H. Katori, Opt. Express **13**, 5253 (2005).
 - [28] T. Ido, T. H. Loftus, M. M. Boyd, A. D. Ludlow, K. W. Holman and J. Ye, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 153001 (2005).
 - [29] J. von Zanthier; Th. Becker, M. Eichenseer, A. Yu.

- Nevsky, Ch. Schwedes, E. Peik, H. Walther, R. Holzwarth, J. Reichert, Th. Udem, T. W. Hänsch, P. V. Pokasov, M. N. Skvortsov, and S. N. Bagayev, *Opt. Lett.* **25**, 1729 (2000).
- [30] J. Stenger, C. Tamm, N. Haverkamp, S. Weyers, and H. R. Telle, *Opt. Lett.* **26**, 1589 (2001).
- [31] S. Bize, S. A. Diddams, U. Tanaka, C. E. Tanner, W. H. Oskay, R. E. Drullinger, T. E. Parker, T. P. Heavner, S. R. Jefferts, L. Hollberg, W. M. Itano, D. J. Wineland, and J. C. Bergquist, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 150802 (2003).
- [32] J. D. Prestage, R. L. Tjoelker, and L. Maleki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3511 (1995).
- [33] H. B. G. Casimir, *On the Interaction Between Atomic Nuclei and Electrons* (Freeman, San Francisco, 1963); C. Schwarz, *Phys. Rev.* **97** (1955) 380.
- [34] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and J. K. Webb, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 230 (1999).
- [35] V. A. Dzuba and V. V. Flambaum, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 034502 (2000).
- [36] A. T. Nguyen, D. Budker, S. K. Lamoreaux, J. R. Torgerson, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 022105 (2004).
- [37] J. Reichert, M. Niering, R. Holzwarth, M. Weitz, Th. Udem, and T. W. Hänsch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 3232 (2000); R. Holzwarth, Th. Udem, T. W. Hänsch, J. C. Knight, W. J. Wadsworth, and P. St. J. Russell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 2264 (2000); S. A. Diddams, D. J. Jones, J. Ye, S. T. Cundiff, J. L. Hall, J. K. Ranka, R. S. Windeler, R. Holzwarth, Th. Udem, and T. W. Hänsch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 5102 (2000).
- [38] V. A. Dzuba, and V. V. Flambaum, to be published.
- [39] R. Engleman, R. D. Cowan and J. M. Peek, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **5**, 2294 (1988).
- [40] D. J. Larson, J. C. Bergquist, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 70 (1986).
- [41] D. J. Wineland, J. C. Bergquist, J. J. Bollinger, R. E. Drullingen, and W. M. Itano, in: *Proceedings of the 6th Symposium Frequency Standards and Metrology*, edited by P. Gill (World Scientific, 2002), p. 361; P. O. Schmidt, T. Rosenband, C. Langer, W. M. Itano, J. C. Bergquist and D. J. Wineland, *Science* **309**, 749 (2005).
- [42] S. N. Atutuv et al., *Physica Scripta T* **105**, **15** (2003).
- [43] K. Gao, Z. Nie, Y. Jiang, and J. Li, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 022702 (2003).
- [44] J. Verdú, S. Djekič, S. Stahl, T. Valenzuela, M. Vogel, G. Werth, T. Beier, H.-J. Kluge and W. Quint, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 093002, (2004).
- [45] T. F. Gallagher and W. E. Cooke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 835 (1979).
- [46] A. Barkan et al., *Optics Letters* **29**, 575 (2004).
- [47] P. Y. Han et al., *Optics Letters* **25**, 675 (2000).
- [48] One has to remember that a standard constraints on α is derived by comparison of two or more optical transitions with different values of $\delta f/f$ and κ , which are nevertheless of the same order of magnitude.